

REMARKS

This paper responds to the Office Action mailed September 17, 2003.

The Examiner is requested to consider the Information Disclosure Statement filed November 21, 2003.

Drawing. The Examiner objects to the drawing as supposedly failing to show the computers 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, the plugin, and the databank as mentioned in the specification at page 7, line 14 and page 8, lines 1, 3, and 5 respectively. The Examiner further objects to the drawing as supposedly failing to show the computers 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, the plugin, and the databank as mentioned in claim 1.

In response to the objections, applicant now provides a replacement drawing sheet attached hereto. As the Examiner will readily appreciate, this sheet differs from the previous sheet as follows:

- database 15 is shown;
- computers 11.1, 11.2, 11.3 are shown;
- plugins 14.1, 14.2, 14.3 are shown.

A paragraph of the specification has been amended to permit the new references numerals (15, 14.1, 14.2, 14.3) to appear in that paragraph. In this way the elements in the claims and in the specification are now portrayed in the drawing.

The changes to the drawing and to the specification are not intended to add new matter but are merely intended to respond to the Examiner's drawing objection regarding features shown in the

specification and shown in the claim.

Art rejection. The Examiner has rejected all claims as supposedly anticipated by a US Pat. No. 5974549 to Golan ("Golan"). The Examiner has suggested that a US Pat. No. 6233341 to Riggins ("Riggins") also anticipates all claims.

The Examiner's attention is also respectfully drawn to the references listed in the IDS filed November 21, 2003.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite additional limitations. The limitations incorporated in claim 1 are disclosed in claim 4 and in the description, page 6, lines 1 to 6. The Examiner is also invited to refer to the surrounding text (page 5, line 14 to page 6, line 20) for an explanation of the function of the claimed invention.

The amended claim 1 takes into account the two references listed in the IDS. According to the invention, the initiative for the execution of the plugin lies with the computer (the "central system 5" of the embodiment) that transmits the plugin and the request for its execution to the other "at least one computers". This allows the central computer to install and run plugins at several remote locations, controlling both the functionality i.e. code of the plugins and the timing of their execution.

The differences between the amended claim on the one hand and the references in the IDS and the references cited in the US office action will now be briefly outlined.

Golan discloses a security monitor running a web browser and executing downloadable components within a secure "sandbox" (col. 2, lines 13-27 and col. 4, lines 51-61). The application is therefore directed to the exact interactions between the components, the browser and the system on which they operate, which may not allow undesired actions to be performed by the downloaded components. As far as the present invention is concerned, Golan does not even

state how the "downloadable components" or "downloaded ActiveX controls" are obtained. It must be therefore assumed that Golan would use the known plugin download model, in which the initiative for downloading and executing the plugin comes from the computer on which the plugin is executed.

Riggins mentions downloadable program code (col. 8, lines 38-45) for various purposes in the context of establishing a secure communications link, labeling the program code "Downloadable". However, a Downloadable is transmitted from a web server engine to a temporary client site upon request from the temporary client site (col. 9, lines 5-12). Again, this is the opposite of the present invention.

Barrick (US Pat. No. 6006260) shows a JavaScript program that is part of a HTML page. The JavaScript is executed in order to measure download times for data received from the server. The initiative for the download and execution of a "browser agent" comes from a user machine executing the browser: "The browser agent is sent to the user machine in response to a user request..." (Abstract). The browser agent then may send download timing information and other data back to a server (col. 4, line 60 to col. 5, line 6). Again, the initiative for downloading and executing the agent comes from the computer on which the agent is executed.

Jalili (US Pat. No. 5423042) shows a server that receives object code from a client. Execution of the codes is controlled by control instructions provided by the client. The goal of the invention is to enable one server to execute code provided by a plurality of clients. In contrast to this, the present invention distributes plugin code from one single central system to several computers, and several instances of the plugins are executed on the several computers. This is exactly the opposite of what is described in Jalili.

In summary, in all instances where there is a superficial likeness to one of the cited documents, closer observation shows that the present invention implements a mechanism that is exactly opposed to what the prior art teaches. The cited documents, neither alone nor in combination,

disclose the method of claim 1.

Reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Carl Oppedahl
PTO Reg. No. 32,746
Oppedahl & Larson LLP
P O Box 5068
Dillon, CO 80435-5068
telephone 970-468-6600
email oppedahl@patents.com